

**DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION  
PROCUREMENT DIVISION  
RECOMMENDATION OF AWARD**

**TO:** Teresa Deaton Reese

**FROM:** Susie Smith

**DATE:** Sept 22, 2009

**EST. AMOUNT:** \$136,863.20

**REQ:** ASA-10-014

**OVER 10% OF ESTIMATE**  
YES:      NO: X

**AGENCY:** All State Agency

**DESCRIPTION:** Tennis/Shower Shoes

**TOTAL NUMBER OF SOLICITED VENDORS:** 198

**TOTALNUMBER OF INDIANA FIRMS SOLICITED:** 142

**TOTAL NUMBER OF MINORITY & WOMAN VENDORS SOLICITED:** MBE 10 WBE 10

**SMALL BUSINESS SET-A-SIDE:** N/A

**RECYCLED PRODUCTS SOLICITED:** N/A

**SECRETARY OF STATE:** All Bidders are registered with the Secretary of State.

**SAVING AMOUNT OF SPLIT:** \$No savings. Split to award all items

**MINORITY BUSINESS PARTICIPATION:** NO If yes, percentage(s) 0 award amount: \$     

**WOMAN-OWNED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION:** NO If yes, percentage(s) 0 award amount: \$     

**QUOTE/BIDS WERE RECEIVED FROM THE FOLLOWING VENDORS:**

<u>VENDOR</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>INDIANA FIRM</u>	<u>PREFERENCE CLAIMED</u>	<u>BUY AMERICAN</u>	<u>EVAL. AMOUNT</u>	<u># OF NO BIDS</u>
1. A. ICS	\$23,124.48	No	None	No	\$23,124.48	13 of 16
2. A. Bob Barker	\$83,265.56	No	None	No	\$83,265.56	10 of 16
3. A. Gold Water Indus	\$116,181.90	No	None	No	\$116,181.90	8 of 16
4. A. Shoe Corp of Birm	\$120,682.60	No	Recycle (15%)	No	\$102,580.21	2 of 16
5. A. Pro Corr Outfitters	\$135,740.88	No	None	No	\$135,740.88	4 of 16
6. A. Kar Wing Trading	\$149,653.68	No	None	No	\$149,653.68	5 of 16

**Second Round Pricing (listed below are the bidders who participated with pricing)**

3. A. Gold Water Indus	\$112,068.00	No	None	No	\$112,068.00	8 of 16
4. A. Shoe Corp of Brim	\$107,394.40	No	Recycle (15%)	No	\$91,285.24	2 of 16
5. A. Pro Corr Outfitters	\$121,969.00	No	None	No	\$121,969.00	4 of 16
6. A. Kar Wing Trading	\$144,831.86	No	None	No	\$144,831.86	5 of 16

**Specifications:**

Specs are satisfactory

**Delays:**

This was delayed as samples were sent for review and testing.

**Preferences:** Per IC 5-22-15-7 – An offeror may claim one (1) of the types of preferences for which the offeror is eligible.

**US Manufactured-** All bidders said no to this preference.

**Recycled Preference-** Shoe Corporation of Birmingham is the manufacturer and supplied certification they are using recycled materials in the manufacturing of their shoes and the boxes and packing materials. Shoe Corporation of Birmingham bid another manufacturer on line #5, therefore the preference wasn't applied to line #5

**Recommendation Narrative:** Samples were submitted for review and testing. See below for the results:

Line 1) Men's Canvas Slip-on- Shoe Corporation of Birmingham is the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications without the recycled preference. I recommend awarding line #1 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham

Line 2) Men's Nylon Jogger tie- Pro Corr Outfitters is the low bidder, however the samples they submitted were Velcro. I contacted the vendor and they stated they don't have nylon and suede in tie only Velcro. Kar Wing Trading is the next low responsive and responsible bidder meeting all specifications. I recommend awarding line #2 to Kar Wing Trading.

Line 3) Men's Leather Tie – Gold Water Industries is the low bidder, however the specifications called for ventilated toe and side and the shoe they submitted didn't have the ventilated toe and side. The shoe they submitted also has suede on the shoe and the specifications didn't call for any suede. Pro Corr Outfitters is the second low bidder, however the Shoe Corporation of Birmingham claimed the recycled preference and claiming this preference makes the Shoe Corporation of Birmingham the overall low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications. I recommend awarding line #3 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham.

Line 4) Men's Leather Velcro – Gold Water Industries is the low bidder, however the Shoe Corporation of Birmingham claimed the recycled preference and claiming this preference makes the Shoe Corporation of Birmingham the overall low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications on this line. I recommend awarding line #4 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham.

Line 5) Men's Leather HI-Top- Shoe Corporation of Birmingham is the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications without claiming the recycled preference. I recommend awarding line #5 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham

Line 6) Men's Leather Mid-HI- Shoe Corporation of Birmingham is the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications without claiming the recycled preference. I recommend awarding line #6 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham

Line 7) Men's Nylon Jogger Velcro- Shoe Corporation of Birmingham is the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications without claiming the recycled preference. I recommend awarding line #7 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham

Line 8) Women's Leather Tie- Pro Corr Outfitters is the low bidder, however the Shoe Corporation of Birmingham claimed the recycled preference and claiming this preference makes the Shoe Corporation of Birmingham the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications. I recommend awarding line #8 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham.

Line 9) Women's Leather Velcro- Pro Corr Outfitters is the low bidder, however the Shoe Corporation of Birmingham claimed the recycled preference and claiming this preference makes the Shoe Corporation of Birmingham the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications. I recommend awarding line #9 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham.

Line 10) Women's Nylon Jogger Velcro- Shoe Corporation of Birmingham is the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications without the recycled preference. I recommend awarding line #10 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham

Line 11) Women's Nylon Jogger Lace –up- Pro Corr Outfitters is the low bidder, however the samples they submitted were Velcro. I contacted the vendor and they stated they don't have nylon and suede in tie only Velcro. Kar Wing Trading is the next low responsive and responsible bidder meeting all specifications. I recommend awarding line #11 to Kar Wing Trading.

Line 12) Women's Classic Slip-on- Shoe Corporation of Birmingham is the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications without the recycled preference. I recommend awarding line #12 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham

Lines 13-15) Youth's leather low-cut, nylon jogger Velcro, and Leather HI-Top- Shoe Corporation of Birmingham is the only bidder on these lines. Their samples meet specifications. Shoe Corporation of Birmingham is the responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications. I recommend awarding lines 13-15 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham.

Line 16) Shower Shoes- Shoe Corporation of Birmingham is the low responsive and responsible bidder meeting specifications without the recycled preference. I recommend awarding line #16 to Shoe Corporation of Birmingham. No bidder supplied the color black.

Line #	QTY	ICS	Bob Barker	Gold Water	Shoe Corp	Recycled	Pro Corr Outfitters	Kar Wing Trading
1	2000	3.96	3.44	2.65	2.20	1.870	2.26	4.36
2	994			8.50		0.000	7.55	7.99
3	1000		12.08	8.50	9.90	8.415	9.15	12.38
4	2600		15.84	8.45	9.90	8.415	9.15	12.38
5	980		12.49		9.95	8.458	10.25	13.18
6	60				10.40	8.840	10.46	
7	5260			8.45	7.00	5.950	7.55	7.99
8	540				9.90	8.415	9.85	12.28
9	50		15.84		9.90	8.415	9.85	12.28
10	720			8.45	7.00	5.950	7.55	7.77
11	2000			8.50		0.000	7.55	7.77
12	120	4.22		2.65	2.15	1.828	2.26	2.32
13	20				9.90	8.415		
14	60				7.00	5.950		
15	40				7.65	6.503		
16	6228	2.36	1.62		1.30	1.105		

After conducting 2 rounds of bidding, the State was able to save **\$11,379.22** on this bid based on negotiations between the vendor and the State of Indiana. This represents a total savings of 8% off the initial bid price

**Split Award:** Split to award to low bidder meeting specifications and the recycled preference

**Sole Source:** N/A

**Award Recommendation:**

**VENDOR**

Shoe Corporation of Birmingham  
Kar Wing Trading

**ITEMS**

Lines 1, 3-10, 12-16  
Lines 2 & 11

**AMOUNT**

\$107,394.40  
\$23,482.06  
Total \$130,876.50

(As applicable to signature authority)

Susie Smith 9/25/09  
Procuring Agent/Procurement Division/Date

Susie Deaton-Reese 9/25/09  
Approval/Date